

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1-5 and 17 have been amended. This amendment is made to even more clearly recite the claimed invention, does not add prohibited new matter and is fully supported by the specification. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The outstanding Office Action dated May 2, 2008 rejects claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over EGLI et al., (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0110234, hereinafter "EGLI") in view of VETRO (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0156108, hereinafter "VETRO"). Applicants respectfully traverse the grounds of the rejection.

According to the present invention, a client sends a URL to a server and the server finds information of the client by using the URL information (i.e., type of client, and the kind of data, such as, for example, MPEG-2, MPEG-4 data that the client can use). Then, the server sends data to the client which is able to be used by the client. For example, the client sends a URL to a server. Using the URL, the server determines that the client can only use MPEG-2 data. Thus, the server sends data formatted as MPEG-2 data.

In contrast, EGLI discloses that a client sends HTTP information to a server and the server sends data to the client which is adjusted. Similarly, VETRO discloses that a server sends data to client and then the client converts the received data to data that is useable by the client.

However, in the claimed invention, the client sends only URL data to a server, the URL comprising an address at which only capability information regarding a device property, an audio

and video coding method, and the input and output of the second terminal is recorded with the server accessing the client through the URL, as recited in the claims. Thus, the server is able to efficiently and effectively send information to the client using the URL. Neither EGLI nor VETRO discloses or suggests, *inter alia*, “a data distribution request receiver that receives a distribution request for data in a format configured for the second terminal and that receives a URL, the URL comprising an address at which only capability information regarding a device property, an audio and video coding method, and the input and output of the second terminal is recorded, the URL being transmitted from the second terminal,” as recited in the claims (using claim 1 as a non-limiting example).

Due to the combination of elements of the claimed invention, terminals having a sufficiently-described structured DIA description can access and select the contents of different formats, and can use another application to extend the usability of the contents. Furthermore, a server or a gateway constructed by the DIA description of a defined structure can select adaptation tools to convert content from one format to another, to match with the required format by a terminal. Based on the teachings of EGLI and VETRO, Applicants submit that one skilled in the art would not be able to arrive at the claimed invention, or achieve the aforementioned advantages of the claimed invention.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that EGLI and VETRO (in any proper combination) fails to disclose or render obvious all of the elements of the claimed invention. Applicants submit that independent claims 1-5 and 17 (and claims dependent therefrom) are not rendered obvious by the cited publications, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections, and an indication of the allowability of all claims pending in the present application in due course. Applicants further submit that the dependent claims are allowable for at least the same


reasons applicable to independent claims 1-5 and 17, and additionally, for the specific features recited in each dependent claim.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Should the Commissioner determine that an extension of time is required in order to render this response timely and/or complete, a formal request for an extension of time, under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a), is herewith made in an amount equal to the time period required to render this response timely and/or complete. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any required extension of time fee under 37 C.F.R. §1.17 to Deposit Account No. 19-0089.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this response, or the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Sheng Mei SHEN et al.



Bruce H. Bernstein  
Reg. No. 29,027

October 1, 2008  
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 Roland Clarke Place  
Reston, VA 20191  
(703) 716-1191

Steven Wegman  
Reg. No. 31,438